



MEETING SUMMARY

TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT ALL-COMMITTEE WORKSHOP BEST WESTERN BELLEVUE INN, BELLEVUE, WA NOVEMBER 28, 2001 — 1:00 P.M. — 5:00 P.M.

INTRODUCTION, WELCOME, AND AGENDA REVIEW

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, reviewed the agenda. The purpose of the workshop was to update the meeting participants on the Urban Corridors Office status; alternative and high capacity transit (HCT) developments; noise; community benefits; and transportation demand management (TDM) information. It was held to share information and in return get feedback from the group. The following points and questions were raised at this time:

- The executive committee on January 30, 2002 will be asked to agree on recommendations to Sound Transit and WSDOT on what alternatives will be evaluated in the draft environmental impact statement. Sound Transit and WSDOT will make the final decision.
- There will still be opportunities to mix and match alternatives with differing interchange elements.
- Rosemary Ives, Mayor of Redmond, asked why the high capacity transit (HCT) analysis was delegated to Sound Transit. David Dye, WSDOT, stressed that Sound Transit and WSDOT are partners and co-leads on the project.

URBAN CORRIDORS OFFICE STATUS

David Dye, WSDOT, explained the reorganization of the Washington State Department of Transportation. With the guidance of new WSDOT Secretary of Transportation, Doug MacDonald, leadership for the various large projects (e.g., Alaskan Way Viaduct, I-405, and Trans-Lake Washington Projects) and operations was restructured. This was done so that the delivery team could implement the mission to finish large projects on time, with broad public support and within budget. The projects were separated into three main sectors, with the following organization; Sound Transit will lead the regional express and light rail projects, Maureen Sullivan will lead the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Trans-Lake Washington Projects; and Craig Stone will lead the I-405 Project. Once the organization was determined, the leadership took stock of the projects, and looked at project connectivity.

Questions and points made during the presentation are noted below:

- Time was allotted for the Trans-Lake Washington Project to further address I-5 and SR 520 interchange issues by allowing time for sound engineering research and data.
- All modes of transportation will be key elements for all of the projects. Transportation demand management (TDM), high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, high capacity transit (HCT), and other transportation modes, will all be focused on as a system.
- Sound Transit's Phase II funding issues will need to be addressed.

HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE FINDINGS

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, presented new information on the highway operational analysis findings compiled since the June 2001 committee meetings. Mr. Peacock provided information on 8-lane alternative function and discussed outstanding questions. As previously noted, the team recommended that alternative 2 (a 4-lane facility) and alternative 3 (a 6-lane facility) be carried forward for further review. Outstanding issues and questions with alternative 4 (an 8-lane facility), which required further study, include:

- Traffic operations for interchanges at I-5, Montlake Boulevard, I-405, and other major interchanges.
- Better understanding of traffic flow along SR 520.

I-5 and SR 520 Interchange Concepts

Jeff Peacock reported that I-5 interchange improvements would be necessary for the 8-lane alternatives. He discussed a previous interchange concept, to alleviate connectivity issues between I-5 and an 8-lane SR 520 facility. This concept would tunnel lanes of SR 520 traffic directly to Eastlake/Fairview, accommodating the 20-25% of traffic destined for downtown Seattle. Significant community concerns existed about that concept.

A different alternate concept to address I-5 interchange issues would reduce current "weave" issues. It would require a SR 520 westbound 2-lane flyover heading southbound on the west side (right) of I-5. This concept would: maintain two lanes of traffic, add an on-ramp on the right side, require minor widening of I-5, and add off-ramps destined for Mercer and Stewart Streets. Also with this concept, the on-ramp for southbound I-5 to eastbound SR 520 would be moved to the western (right) side of I-5. The operational analysis showed that the added capacity wouldn't create any adverse effects on southbound I-5. There are remaining difficulties with the Mercer Street off-ramp that will need to be addressed. The concept would have some positive effects on I-5, along with SR 520. The ramps at Harvard and Mercer Streets may possibly cause minor displacements, which could be minimized.

Questions and points made at this point in the presentation are noted below.

- The 6-lane facility would not need to be tunneled to Eastlake.
- The HOV lanes would connect with the express lanes southbound and northbound on I-5.
- There will still need to be answers on how current traffic on Mercer Street would be affected.
- This concept appears to offer significant weave-reduction benefits for the 6-lane alternatives as well.

Montlake Boulevard and SR 520 Interchange Concepts

Jeff Peacock reported on the Montlake interchange analysis. From the beginning of the Trans-Lake Washington study phase, there has been an agreement that widening Montlake Boulevard would not be an option. The highway findings show that a SR 520 6-lane facility would cause a slight worsening of today's traffic conditions. An 8-lane facility, however, would overwhelm and entail major traffic difficulties for Montlake Boulevard. A proposed concept to alleviate the Montlake Boulevard interchange difficulties would be to add tunnel off-ramp and on-ramp connections between SR 520 and Pacific Street, under or over the Montlake Cut. This concept would separate traffic destined to the University of Washington from Montlake Boulevard and might result in lower traffic levels from today. This would require stacking of the intersection of Montlake Boulevard and Pacific Avenue, and would need to be accommodated with widening Montlake Boulevard, from where the tunnel merges to about NE 45th Avenue. An alternate concept to alleviate Montlake Boulevard congestion would be to add another bridge over Portage Bay and connect to Pacific Street. This fixed structure would be 70 feet high to allow navigational access.

The following questions and points were brought out at this time:

- Rosemary Ives, Mayor of Redmond asked whether the Montlake Boulevard interchange concepts would create additional single occupancy vehicle capacity.
- HOV lane access should be a top priority, especially over single occupancy vehicle access.
- Rideshare programs would continue to be provided at the University of Washington.
- For the Montlake interchange, it was found that HOV access was difficult. Adding a HOV ramp at the Arboretum and the Lake Washington interchange was also found to be difficult. Tunneling to Pacific Street would require an off-ramp exit on the right side of SR 520, while the HOV lane would be on the left side of SR 520. The interchange concepts do not, however, preclude links for HOV access.
- Study focus has been on the challenging I-5, Montlake Boulevard, and I-405 interchanges. This doesn't mean that the project team is ignoring any of the interchanges elsewhere.
- For the 6-lane SR 520 facility, it is not yet known whether an alternate interchange concept would be required.

I-405 and SR 520 Interchange Concepts

Jeff Peacock discussed research done for the I-405 interchange in coordination with the I-405 Project. I-405 interchange analysis shows that connection will be quite complex.

The following points and questions were brought out at this time:

- I-405 improvements will be much more complex than today to accommodate either a 6-lane or 8-lane facility. This complex I-405 interchange is possible to build, but would require approximately 60 displacements that would primarily be commercial.
- Three out of four of the I-405 interchange movements would have HOV lane to HOV lane direct connections. The Kirkland to the NE quadrant (southbound from Kirkland to eastbound on SR 520) would not have direct HOV lane access, as proposed by the project team.

Overview of Interchanges Concepts

Jeff Peacock provided a brief overview of the points and issues made from highway interchange findings for the 8-lane facility on SR 520:

- With the addition of one of the I-5 interchange concepts, I-5 southbound and express lanes would flow without significant detrimental effects.
- There will need to be further work done for the Mercer Street connection.
- Montlake Boulevard would require widening at the northern side of the Portage Bay connection, in order to accommodate additional traffic.

The 8-lane facility functions well, but is held up by congestion at interchanges. Less than a full lane of traffic would be added to SR 520 with the 8-lane facility, due to metering delays on the arterials. The findings showed travel time attractiveness. For an 8-lane facility, the general purpose travel time would be 13-15 minutes between 124th and I-5, while in the year 2020 with no action it would take 50 minutes. The 6-lane facility general purpose travel time would be 17 - 20 minutes. HOV access would have a travel time of 10 minutes. The present travel time during peak periods is 20 – 30 minutes.

The following points and questions were made at this time:

- The travel times reported take into account improved interchange concepts for the 8-lane facility.
- Additional work will need to be done for local traffic improvements in the regional model highway operational analysis. The next step for the EIS will be to merge the interchange concepts with material improvements for each intersection, including the level of service, and then add all of this information into the model.
- One objective of the project is to get people to no longer use arterials and side streets as a primary method for avoiding SR 520.
- To differentiate between alternatives, one measure of congestion is showing where there would be traffic queues with speeds of 30 miles per hour or less.

- Analysis shows that in the year 2020, the 8-lane facility would have two to three and a half hours of queuing during peak periods. With no action, four to five hours of stop-and-go congestion would occur, and the extent of queuing would be much longer. The main area of congestion would be at the Montlake Boulevard intersection and/or approaching I-5.
- Congestion would vary for each interchange.

Outstanding High Capacity Transit Questions

Jeff Peacock reminded the group of the outstanding high capacity transit alternative questions as of last June. The questions that required further study were:

- Need to assess traffic and structural impacts to I-90 with light rail and HOV lane scenarios
- Evaluate an HCT structure parallel to I-90; potential changes in LINK light rail alignment relative to SR 520 high capacity transit alignment.
- Compare costs and benefits of I-90 versus an SR 520 high capacity transit system.

HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT FINDINGS

Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit, reviewed the major findings for HCT on SR 520 and I-90. Ms. Gilliland presented progress made on the I-90 two-way transit project and I-90 light rail transit. I-90 light rail transit analysis has included additional modeling with light rail on a separate bridge parallel to I-90.

I-90 Two-Way Transit Project

The I-90 two-way transit project outcomes found that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) concurs with including an alternative that adds HOV lanes to the outer roadway (R8a) in the EIS. The Sound Transit Board and WSDOT identified the following EIS alternatives in addition to no action: R2b with a two-way center roadway, R5 and **R5** modified with transit-only shoulders, and R8a with added HOV lanes. There are open houses coming up for the I-90 two-way transit project in December. The project schedule aims to complete the design next year, finish the EIS, and then complete construction in 2004.

I-90 Light Rail Transit

I-90 light rail transit modeling looked at placing light rail on I-90, reducing HOV access, and found resulting traffic impacts to SR 520. With this change, the Trans-Lake vehicle and person trips would be reduced by 2% in the peak period and 1% daily, and the SR 520 vehicle and person trips would increase by 7% in the peak period and 2% daily.

Geometric evaluation for I-90 light rail transit assumed three general purpose lanes and an HOV lane. It was shown that light rail operations in the center roadway would require less space than the current reversible lanes, would not preclude adding HOV lanes to the outer roadway, and would slightly improve the geometric feasibility of adding HOV lanes to the outer roadway.

Light rail takes less space and adds extra space on the roadway for the shoulders on the bridge portion. Various comparisons were done between the I-90 two-way transit project alternative R8a and the Trans-Lake Washington project alternatives. Through this comparison, it was shown that Trans-Lake alternative 3 would result in 3% higher traffic volumes and similar or slightly higher congestion on the I-90 outer roadways.

Additional I-90 light rail feasibility analysis has been completed. This work looked at structural analysis done by the WSDOT Bridge Division and reviewed the feasibility of a rail joint across the transition from a fixed to a floating bridge structure. The I-90 light rail structural analysis showed that added weight from light rail can be mitigated using reasonable cost methods (costing \$11 - 12 million) by either replacing the existing south concrete side barrier with a cable railing, removing existing ballast within the floating bridge with pontoon cells, or replacing one inch of existing concrete overlay in the center lanes with a quarter inch concrete polymer overlay. Sound Transit looked at modern light rail bridges around the world with similar joint movements to the potential I-90 light rail joint. The modern Skytrain Bridge in Vancouver across the Fraser River and Tagus River Bridge in Lisbon, Portugal were found to be similar to I-90. Although they found no floating bridge examples, the I-90 structure was not found to be significantly different than these examples.

A “worst case” scenario for light rail transit on the I-90 corridor would require a separate floating bridge parallel to I-90 for light rail transit. Construction costs would be more than \$700 million higher than the HCT component of Trans-Lake Washington Project alternatives 2, 3, and 4, but this is still nearly \$1.5 billion less than a comparable SR 520 route. HCT environmental impacts would be slightly higher on SR 520, particularly in shoreline areas, but overall environmental performance is similar.

High Capacity Transit Recommendations

Sound Transit staff has made HCT recommendations to its organization, including:

- Near-term transit improvements on SR 520 and I-90
- Combined HOV and bus rapid transit (BRT) improvements to be included in the Trans-Lake Washington project level EIS
- Future HCT (using rail technology) should be added to the I-90 corridor. This is a programmatic decision that will be documented as a separate section within the Trans-Lake EIS.
- Exploring preserving, not precluding, SR 520 HCT ROW

Sound Transit staff recommend that the Trans-Lake Washington Project examine direct-access BRT combined with an HOV environment, similar to what is done for the I-405 Project. The transit in the EIS alternatives should:

- Plan for SR 520 combined HOV/BRT lanes with a four-foot buffer
- Study direct access connections at the University District, south Kirkland, I-405, and Overlake
- Have HOV/BRT stations replace functions of existing flyer stops at Montlake and, if desired, at Evergreen Point and Yarrow Point

- Not advance the south Lake Union bus route any further, due to cost, impacts, and capacity constraints
- Include connections to and from I-5 reversible lanes
- Plan for “No Action” in 2020, when transit capacity downtown is reached and an HCT line may be required to accommodate demand beyond 2020

I-90 would be the preferred corridor for fixed guideway HCT due to better serving capacity into downtown Bellevue, balancing demand with Central LINK to north Seattle, incorporating the same ridership levels as would be on SR 520, lowering the capital cost (\$1.8 to 2.3 billion), and lessening environmental impacts.

During the HCT discussion, the following points and questions were raised:

- The Trans-Lake Washington Project is not a 20-year solution, but a 50 to 60-year solution.
- For the R-8a alternative in the I-90 two-way transit project, the general purpose traffic allowed from Mercer Island in the center roadway would be added to general traffic flow in the outer roadway.
- Keeping light rail transit constant for the center roadway, what are the different impacts occurring on SR 520 and not on I-90?

NOISE AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES

Les Rubstello, WSDOT, and Michael Minor, Minor and Associates, explained the noise analysis. The noise data were collected at 20 long-term (24-hour) sites and 70 short-term (15-30-minute) sites. Noise mitigation is required when new construction results in noise levels approaching 67 dBA (e.g., at 66 dBA) or when new construction results in an increase of 10 dBA over existing levels. Numerous receptors along SR 520 currently exceed the 67 dBA threshold. A case study in the vicinity of the 84th Avenue and SR 520 interchange examined varying noise mitigations, such as noise walls and lids. The human ear can only detect noise level changes at increments of 3 dBA. The findings showed that noise walls significantly lowered noise, and in many places, equalled the noise reduction of the largest lid.

COMMUNITY BENEFITS THROUGH POTENTIAL ENHANCEMENTS

Les Rubstello reported that the costs of lids are very high compared to other enhancements. The largest benefit to lidding on SR 520 would be to connect communities. Also, lids increase visual aesthetics and livability, while an ancillary benefit is noise reduction. The project team suggested that lids and other community enhancements will be determined in Spring 2002. The focus in January is planned to be on decisions for the 4, 6, and 8-lane facilities. If, however, the Executive Committee chooses to combine the decisions, that is possible.

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Les Rubstello discussed information on transportation demand management (TDM) components for build alternatives. The overall goal of this recommendation is to have a minimum of 20% of all corridor trips using HOV, transit, or other alternative transportation modes. The TDM program would have around \$200 million to be used for different strategies.

The following points and questions were brought up from the TDM presentation:

- John Shadoff, WSDOT, would monitor the land-use and TDM agreement program and will be working with local jurisdictions and transit representatives to come to agreement on how TDM program funds are spent. The TDM program will be developed further over time.
- Today 7-10 % of the total person trips are using alternative transportation modes other than the single occupancy vehicle mode.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

After the group convened in breakout groups to talk with project staff and learn more about the information presented, the participants reconvened to summarize questions and issues raised in breakouts. General discussion at the end of the meeting yielded the following key issues and questions:

Systems Coordination

- The I-405 programmatic decisions will somewhat affect I-90 and Trans-Lake Washington Project decisions. The preferred I-405 alternative will affect SR 520 and I-405 interchange work. The Trans-Lake Washington Project will plan around I-405 Project decisions. (Modeling work, however, has not shown an increased demand on SR 520 due to a widen I-405.)
- Will added capacity on I-405 induce demand on SR 520?
- Can the EIS look at regional governance issues?
- Legislator Ed Murray should be contacted to give input on transportation projects.
- A bill went to the legislature that looked at funding transportation projects within a region. This funding strategy will most likely be on the ballot in three to five years from now.

High Capacity Transit

- If the HOV/BRT alternative moves forward, the timeline states that the HOV/BRT system will be built in 2015. Then, according to the model, if light rail on I-90 is not in place, the system will be over capacity in 2020. To partially alleviate this concern, 2030 modeling will be done for the environmental review, and to assist Sound Transit in planning the implementation of both the HOV/BRT and light rail
- HCT options for SR 520 have the flexibility of being preserved in the center or on the outer edges of the roadway.
- With an 8-lane and HCT preservation alternative, would the right-of-way be moved and additional property takings be required?

- Is HOV/BRT still “congestion free,” as it is currently designed to operate with cars in the HOV lanes? An alternative description from Sound Transit for the proposed BRT on SR 520 is to describe it as an HOV expressway. Time will need to be spent analyzing the entire transit network.
- Sound Transit recommends light rail (HCT) for I-90 remain in the long-range vision.
- Do the costs for I-90 compare to costs required for purchasing the right-of-way in SR 520? The I-90 light rail transit costs include routes to Bellevue and Kirkland.
- The main system objective is flexibility. HOV /BRT lanes may give the project that flexibility, without fixing routes, such as is done with light rail.
- In 2020, there will be bus constraints, particularly in downtown Seattle.
- Has Sound Transit looked at not running light rail transit through downtown Seattle and keeping BRT on I-90? Would this change the current analysis for SR 520?
- The project should continue to look at HCT on SR 520, ending at the University of Washington.
- Evaluate HOV/BRT in terms of total capacity and capacity acceptable to the Downtown Seattle Association.
- More information is needed on the freight impacts from putting light rail transit on I-90.
- The Trans-Lake Washington HCT Options Report done by Sound Transit is available online at: www.rtg.com. Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit, will make this available, along with comments concerning this report.

Transportation Demand Management

- The TDM does not appear to be very aggressive. What would a more aggressive TDM program look like? There is uncertainty at this time as to who will lead the TDM program and what its methods will be.
- A more aggressive TDM package should be looked at in combination with each alternative, with a rideshare goal of 30-40%. As set previously for the Trans-Lake Washington Project Study, TDM strategies would be done at the most aggressive level possible.
- Where will pricing be considered by the project?
- The project should examine how many cars can be removed using HCT or TDM components, and then figure out how many lanes will not need to be built due to these components.
- Is current TDM funding less than 4% of the cost to build additional roadway capacity? If more money was put into TDM, would the need for roadway capacity decrease and more money be saved in the long run?
- Go beyond the traditional TDM package and include partnerships with private businesses, etc. The TDM should look at alternative non-motorized transportation strategies.
- Clarify the definition of TDM and consider using the broadest definition possible.
- The project should take into account the reduction in single occupancy vehicle accommodation from TDM measures. If the TDM budget was increased, could this reduce the need for additional lane capacity?
- Are we double-pricing TDM? This is a problem that should be looked at more regionally, not just with a specific project.

Executive Committee Recommendation

- The noise impacts will not be available until after January; however, the information about impacts may influence the January Executive Committee recommendation.
- Initially, the recommendation on the EIS alternatives was to include the question of enhancements, such as lids. It will be difficult to agree on a recommendation if these are not considered together as a package.
- The alternatives chosen for environmental review will not have an effect on what mitigations and enhancements to implement, such as lid improvements. Discussion on potential mitigations and enhancements will be continued after January.

ACTION ITEMS

Pat Serie asked the meeting participants to send their reactions to the workshop information and other ideas to Amy Grotefendt, EnviroIssues.

Suggested materials to distribute to the committees are:

- Current TDM summary
- Project schedule
- November 28, 2001 meeting summary
- Trans-Lake Washington HCT Options Report and comments

NEXT STEPS

There will be additional committee discussion of the multi-modal alternatives at committee meetings on December 12, January 9, and 30, for the Advisory, Technical, and Executive Committees, respectively. Les Rubstello stated that the project is funded until June of 2003, which is before the EIS analysis would be completed. The project's future is dependent on funding.

MEETING HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Summer 2001 conclusions/outstanding questions presentation – Jeff Peacock, speaker
- Transit alternatives presentation – Barbara Gilliland, speaker
- Community benefits through potential enhancements presentation – Les Rubstello, speaker
- Transportation demand management presentation – Les Rubstello, speaker

- SR 520 Corridor: 4-lane, 6-lane, and 8-lane alternatives distinguishing environmental impacts
- Public comment from Jean G. Amick, Laurelhurst community representative
- Public comment from Clarissa Easton, Montlake Community Club

MEETING ATTENDEES

Executive Committee Members

Present	Name	Organization
X	Becker Daniel	City of Medina
X	Berry Jeanne	Town of Yarrow Point
	Cairns Bryan	City of Mercer Island
	Clarke Chuck	City of Seattle
X	Conlin Richard	City of Seattle
X	Crawford Jack	Sound Transit Board
X	Davis Aubrey	Washington Transportation Commission
	Earling Dave	Sound Transit Board
	Edwards Bob	Puget Sound Regional Council
	Hughes Gary	Federal Highway Administration
X	Ganz Nona	City of Kirkland
X	Gehrke Linda	Federal Transit Administration
	Grigsby Daryl	City of Seattle
	Horn Jim	Washington State Senate
X	Ives Rosemarie	City of Redmond
	Jacobsen Ken	Washington State Senate
X	Marshall Connie	City of Bellevue
	Martin George	City of Clyde Hill
X	McConkey Fred	Town of Hunts Point
	McIver Richard	City of Seattle
X	McKenna Rob	King County Council
	Murray Ed	WA State House of Representatives
X	Noble Phil	City of Bellevue
	Okamoto John	WSDOT - NW Region
	Pflug Cheryl	WA State House of Representatives
	Sullivan Cynthia	King County Council
	Taniguchi Harold	King County Department of Transportation

Executive Committee Alternates

Present	Name	Organization
X	Asher David	City of Kirkland
X	Bowman Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
	Drais Dan	FTA
	Carpenter Trish	Town of Hunts Point
	McKenzie Jack	Town of Hunts Point
	Creighton Mike	City of Bellevue
X	Demitriades Paul	City of Medina
X	Dye Dave	WSDOT - NW Region
	Earl Joni	Sound Transit
	Hague Jane	King County Council

	Jahncke	El	City of Mercer Island
	Conrad	Richard	City of Mercer Island
	Kargianis	George	Washington Transportation Commission
X	Paine	Thomas	City of Redmond
	Rourke	Philip	City of Clyde Hill
	Rutledge	Steve	City of Yarrow Point
X	Schoneman	Noel	City of Seattle

Technical Committee Members

Present	Name	Organization
	Arndt Jim	City of Kirkland
X	Billen Don	Sound Transit
X	Bowman Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
	Brooks Allyson	Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
	Conrad Richard	City of Mercer Island
	Cushman King	Puget Sound Regional Council
X	Dewey Peter	University of Washington
	Fisher Larry	Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
	(Steve Kalinowski)	
X	Gibbons Tom	National Marine Fisheries Service
	Kennedy Jack	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
	Kenny Ann	Washington Department of Ecology
X	Kircher Dave	Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
	Leonard Jim	Federal Highway Administration
X	Marpert Terry	City of Redmond
X	Martin Ann	King County Department of Transportation
X	Newstrum Len	Town of Yarrow Point
	Pratt Austin	U.S. Coast Guard, 13 th District
X	Rave Krista	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
X	(Jonathan Freedman)	
X	Sanchez Susan	City of Seattle
X	Schulze Doug	City of Medina
	Sparrman Goran	City of Bellevue
X		(Bernard van de Kamp)
X	Sullivan Maureen	WSDOT – NW Region
	Teachout Emily	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
X	Wasserman Mitch	City of Clyde Hill
X	Willis Joe	Town of Hunts Point

Advisory Committee Members

Present	Name
X	Amick Jean
	Andrews Deborah
X	Aschenbach Hans
	Beltz Allison
X	Culp Barbara
	Dent Bob

X	Eades	Bertha
	Gatchet	Dan
X	Gunby	Virginia
	Hallenbeck	Mark
	Hart	Fred
	Hill	Jim
	Hill	Gregory
X	Holman	Linda
	Hurley	Peter
X	Joneson	Kingsley
	Leed	Jean
X	MacIsaac	Jim
X	Newstrum	Elizabeth
	Odell	Nina
X	Ray	Janet
X	Reckers, Jr.	James
X	Resha	John
	Sheck	Ronald
	Stelle	Claudia
X	Tate	Bob
	Tochterman	Thomas B.
X	Wasserman	Eugene
	Weed	Mark
	White	Rich
	White	Roland
	Wyble	John

Other attendees

Maurice Cooper, Madison Park
 Daniel Bray, TRUST
 Nancy Adams, TRUST
 Dave Asher, City of Kirkland
 Pat Keurney, The Stranger
 Jack A. Austin, SYC
 Jonathan Dubman, Montlake
 Clarissa Easton, Montlake
 David Maymudes
 Ned Conroy, Puget Sound Regional Council
 Kim Becklund, City of Bellevue
 WM Bain, SYC
 Theodore Lane, NOISE
 David Godfrey, City of Kirkland
 John Resha, Greater Redmond Transit Management Authority
 Steve Kennedy, Sound Transit

Project Team

Les Rubstello, WSDOT
Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT
Dave Dye, WSDOT
Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit
Jeff Peacock, Parametrix
Don Billen, Sound Transit
Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill
Margaret Clancy, Parametrix
Don Weitkamp, Parametrix
Michael Minor, Michael Minor and Associates
Jeff Brauns, Parametrix
Lindsay Yamane, Parametrix
Dave Hilderbrant, Parametrix
Cathy Strombom, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Hans Saxer, Parsons Brinkerhoff
Mark Scheibe, Parsons Brinkerhoff
Jane Farquharson, PSTC
Steve Kennedy, Sound Transit
Tom Hamstra, Parametrix
Dave Hilderbrandt, Parametrix
Brad Phillips, Parametrix
Sandra Fann, Parametrix
Michael Horntvedt, Parametrix
John Perlic, Parametrix
Daryl Wendle, Parametrix
John Shadoff, WSDOT
Jean Mabry, WSDOT
Eric Shimizu, CH2M Hill
Pat Serie, EnviroIssues
Amy Grotefendt, EnviroIssues
Jennifer Cannon, EnviroIssues

JJC